Application No Applicant(s) 10/061,151 SCHWARTZ ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner **Art Unit** Elena Tsoy 1762 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (3) Steteinie Maurer (1) Elena Tsoy. (2) Harns Pitlick Date of Interview: 24 June 2003. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: All rejected claims Identification of prior art discussed: All applied att Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE

INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

- I Attorney argued that Murao is applied as outside coating and requires particular the use of nonionic surfactants.
- 2. Kypopka should be initialed accor beause it was discussed in specification (see page 2, lines 31+).